

THE INFLUENCE OF ONLINE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT, LECTURERS'
ASSESSMENT PRACTICE, AND STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS ON
STUDENTS' PLAGIARISM PRACTICES

ANDI ANTO PATAK

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Measurement and Evaluation)

Faculty of Education
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JUNE 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I was in contact with many researchers and academicians in the process of writing this thesis. They contributed to my insights on the scope of this research. I am grateful to my supervisor, Dr. Hamimah Abu Naim, for her constructive criticism, suggestions, and motivation. The support and encouragement from my supervisor allowed me to accomplish this thesis.

I must also express my most profound appreciation to the Governor of South Sulawesi, Indonesia for funding my Ph.D study. I acknowledge the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia for its UTM International Doctoral Fellowship. I would like to express my gratitude to the UTM Librarian for their support in providing the best service for online book and article access.

I sincerely thank my colleagues for their support. Their advice was meaningful; unfortunately, it is not possible to list their names in this limited space. I dedicate this thesis to my beloved mother and my father for their prayers for my success and their everlasting love. I devote this thesis to my daughters (Andi Rofifah Adha Patak, and Andi Izzatunnisa Patak) and my wife (Andiana, S.Pd.) for their lifelong love.

ABSTRACT

Higher education in Indonesia encourages university students to publish their work as part of lecturers' assessments to inculcate an academic writing culture. Lack of students' knowledge about plagiarism indicates a need for more studies on the effect of plagiarism on Online Learning Environment (OLE), Lecturers' Assessment Practice (LAP), and Students' Writing Skills (SWS). Lack of plagiarism awareness and prevention measures as well as lecturers' feedback on student writing seems to exacerbate plagiarism practice. Therefore, this study assessed the influence of OLE, LAP, and SWS on Student Plagiarism Practices (SPP). In this study, OLE refers to twelve subcontracts, including relevance, reflection, interaction, collaboration, tutor support, peer support, making sense, instructor support, authentic learning, active learning, student autonomy, computer competence, and material environment. LAP refers to language assessment and written work assessment. Meanwhile, SWS refers to sub constructs such as organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, mechanics, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing, summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty. Finally, SPP refers to attitudes toward plagiarism and norms toward plagiarism. A multi-stage clustered sampling technique was used to select 155 lecturers teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) on Sulawesi Island as respondents. This study used a concurrent mixed method research design. A set of questionnaires was used to measure lecturers' perceptions on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP. An interview protocol was used to reveal EFL lecturers' perceptions on student learning experiences for OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP. The mean difference in lecturers' perception on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP based on gender and academic qualification was also examined. The relationship between OLE and SPP; LAP and SPP; and SWS and SPP were investigated using simple linear regression. The influence of OLE, LAP, and SWS on SPP was measured using multiple regression. This study showed that EFL lecturers' perceptions on OLE were mostly at the expected level, whereas LAP and SPP were at the expected level while SWS mostly showed the difficult level. The results of the *t*-test showed that there was no significant mean difference in lecturers' perception on OLE, LAP, and SWS based on gender and academic qualification. Simple linear regression showed that there was a significant relationship between OLE and SPP; and between LAP and SPP. Multiple regression results indicated that LAP had the most influence on SPP. Students' learning experiences as reported by EFL lecturers in the interview results showed that reflection was dominant in OLE, and language assessment was dominant for LAP influence on SPP, especially for norms towards plagiarism. This study revealed that LAP has important implications for increasing students' awareness on the importance of avoiding plagiarism, besides supporting the Ministry of Research and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia's policy to prevent plagiarism.

ABSTRAK

Pendidikan tinggi di Indonesia menggalakkan pelajar universiti untuk menerbitkan penulisan mereka sebagai sebahagian daripada penilaian pensyarah untuk menyokong budaya penulisan akademik. Kurangnya pengetahuan pelajar tentang plagiarisme menunjukkan keperluan untuk kajian yang lebih banyak tentang kesan plagiarisme terhadap persekitaran pembelajaran atas talian (OLE), amalan pentaksiran pensyarah (LAP), dan kemahiran menulis pelajar (SWS). Kurangnya kesedaran dan langkah pencegahan amalan plagiarisme serta maklum balas pensyarah terhadap penulisan pelajar seolah-olah memburukkan lagi amalan plagiarisme. Oleh itu, kajian ini menilai OLE, LAP, dan SWS terhadap amalan plagiarisme pelajar (SPP). Dalam kajian ini, OLE merujuk kepada dua belas sub-pembinaan seperti relevan, refleksi, interaksi, kerjasama, sokongan tutor, sokongan rakan sebaya, pengertian, sokongan pengajar, pembelajaran yang sah, pembelajaran aktif, autonomi pelajar, kecekapan komputer dan persekitaran material. LAP merujuk kepada penilaian bahasa dan penilaian kerja bertulis. Sementara itu, SWS merujuk kepada sub-pembinaan seperti organisasi, kandungan, tatabahasa, tanda baca, ejaan, mekanik, perbendaharaan kata, rujukan, sebutan, peringkasan, meringkaskan, petikan, sintesis, dan ketulenan. Akhirnya, SPP merujuk kepada sikap dan norma pelajar terhadap plagiarisme. Teknik pensampelan berkelompok digunakan untuk memilih 155 orang pensyarah mengajar Bahasa Inggeris sebagai Bahasa Asing (EFL) di Pulau Sulawesi sebagai responden. Kajian ini menggunakan reka bentuk penyelidikan kaedah campuran bersamaan. Satu set soal selidik digunakan untuk mengukur persepsi pensyarah mengenai OLE, LAP, SWS, dan SPP. Protokol temuduga digunakan untuk menjelaskan persepsi pensyarah EFL ke atas pengalaman pembelajaran pelajar untuk OLE, LAP, SWS, dan SPP. Perbezaan persepsi pensyarah terhadap OLE, LAP, SWS, dan SPP berdasarkan jantina dan kelayakan akademik juga diukur. Hubungan antara OLE dan SPP; LAP dan SPP; dan SWS dan SPP diukur dengan menggunakan regresi berganda. Kesan OLE, LAP, dan SWS terhadap SPP diukur menggunakan regresi berganda. Keputusan ujian t menunjukkan bahawa tidak terdapat perbezaan min yang signifikan dalam persepsi pensyarah terhadap OLE, LAP, dan SWS berdasarkan jantina dan kelayakan akademik. Analisis regresi linear mudah menunjukkan bahawa terdapat hubungan yang signifikan antara OLE dan SPP; dan antara LAP dan SPP. Hasil regresi berganda menunjukkan bahawa LAP mempunyai kesan yang paling besar terhadap SPP. Berdasarkan pengalaman pembelajaran belajar pelajar seperti yang dilaporkan oleh pensyarah EFL dalam hasil wawancara menunjukkan bahawa refleksi adalah pengalaman belajar yang dominan dalam OLE, dan penilaian bahasa adalah dominan untuk kesan LAP terhadap SPP, terutama aspek norma terhadap plagiarisme. Kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa LAP mempunyai implikasi penting untuk meningkatkan kesedaran pelajar mengenai pentingnya mengelak plagiarisme, selain menyokong Kementerian Penyelidikan dan Pendidikan Tinggi dasar Republik Indonesia untuk mencegah plagiarisme.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRACT	v
	ABSTRAK	v
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF TABLES	xi
	LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
	LIST OF ABBREVIATION	xv
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvi
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xvii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Introduction	1
	1.2 Background of the Study	4
	1.3 Statement of Problems	8
	1.4 Objectives of the Study	9
	1.5 Research Question	10
	1.6 Hypothesis	11
	1.7 Scope of the the Study	11
	1.8. The Significance of the Study	13
	1.9 Theoretical Framework	14
	1.10 Conceptual Framework	15
	1.11 Definition of Terms	18
	1.11.1 English as a Foreign Language	18

	1.11.2 Online Learning Environment	18
	1.11.3 Lecturers' Assessment Practice	19
	1.11.4 Students' Writing Skills	20
	1.11.5 Students' Plagiarism Practices	20
	1.12 Summary	21
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	23
	2.1 Introduction	23
	2.2 The Principle of Online Learning, Assessment, Writing Skills, and Plagiarism	23
	2.3 Previous Findings	29
	2.3.1 Gender and Academic Qualification on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skill, and Students' Plagiarism Practice	29
	2.3.2 Online Learning Environment	30
	2.3.3 Lecturers' Assessment Practice	38
	2.3.4 Students' Writing Skills	44
	2.3.5 Students' Plagiarism Practices	54
	2.4 Summary	59
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	61
	3.1 Introduction	61
	3.2 The Design of the Study	61
	3.3 Population	62
	3.4 Sample	64
	3.5 Instrument of the Study	66
	3.5.1 Questionnaire	66
	3.5.2 Interview Protocol	68
	3.6 Variables	69
	3.7 Pilot Study	75
	3.7.1 Validity and Reliability	76
	3.7.2 Rasch Model	77
	3.8 Data Collection Procedure	89

3.9	Data Analysis	91
3.9.1	Item Reliability Analysis	91
3.9.2	Quantitative	100
3.9.3	Qualitative	104
3.10	Summary	107
4	FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS	109
4.1	Introduction	109
4.2	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices	109
4.2.1	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Online Learning Environment	110
4.2.2	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Lecturers Assessment Practice	112
4.2.3	EFL Lecturers' Perception Level on Students' Writing Skills	113
4.2.4	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Students' Plagiarism Practices	114
4.3	Gender and Academic Qualification Differences on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices	115
4.3.1	Gender Differences on Online Learning Environment	116
4.3.2	Academic Qualification Differences on Online Learning Environment	117
4.3.3	Gender Differences on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	118
4.3.4	Academic Qualification Difference on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	119
4.3.5	Gender Difference on Students' Writing Skills	121

4.3.6	Academic Qualification Difference on Students' Writing Skills	122
4.3.7	Gender Difference on Students' Plagiarism Practices	123
4.3.8	Academic Qualification Difference Students' Plagiarism Practices	124
4.4	Relationship between OLE and SPP, LAP and SPP, SWS and SPP	126
4.4.1	Relationship between Online Learning Environment and Students' Plagiarism Practices	126
4.4.2	Relationship between Lecturers' Assessment Practice and Students Plagiarism Practices	127
4.4.3	Relationship between Students' Writing Skills and Students' Plagiarism Practices	128
4.5	The Influence of Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, and Students' Writing Skills on Students' Plagiarism Practices	129
4.6	The EFL Lecturers' Perception on the Students' Learning Experience on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices	132
4.6.1	Theme 1: Online Learning Environment	133
4.6.2	Theme 2: Lecturers' Assessment Practice	136
4.6.3	Theme 3: Students' Plagiarism Practices	139
4.7	Summary of Results	143
5	DISCUSSION, IMPLICATION, AND RECOMMENDATION	145
5.1	Introduction	145
5.2	Discussions	145
5.3	Implication of the Research	156
5.4	Recommendation for Further Research	158
5.5	Summary	159
	REFERENCES	161
	Appendices A-K	183-224

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
3.1	EFL lecturers of State Universities in Sulawesi Island	63
3.2	Number of EFL Lecturers of State Universities in Sulawesi as Required Sample	65
3.3	Demography of the respondents	67
3.4	Agreement type Likert Scale	67
3.5	Variables	69
3.6	Constructs Measured	70
3.7	Fit Person of 40 Respondents	79
3.8	Person Reliability of 40 Respondents	80
3.9	Person Reliability of 35 Persons	81
3.10	Item Reliability of 125 Items of 40 Persons	81
3.11	Fit Items of 40 Persons	82
3.12	Item Reliability of 125 items of 35 Persons	83
3.13	Fit Items Table of 35 Persons	84
3.14	Dimensionality Table of 40 Persons	85
3.15	Item Dimensionality of 35 Persons	86
3.16	Scale Calibration of 40 Persons	86
3.17	Scale Calibration of 35 Respondents	88
3.18	Reliability Statistics	91
3.19	Item-Total Statistics	92
3.20	Scale Statistics	97
3.21	Item-Total Statistics of the Remaining 40 Items	98
3.22	Scale Statistics of the Remaining 40 Items	99
3.23	Reliability Statistics of Remaining 40 Items	100

3.24	Mean-Square Score	101
3.25	Statistical Test for Hypotheses using SPSS 23	103
3.26	The Phase of Braun and Clarke's Thematic Analysis	105
4.1	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Online Learning Environment	110
4.2	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	112
4.3	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Students' Writing Skills	113
4.4	EFL Lecturers' Perception on Students' Plagiarism Practices	114
4.5	Gender and Academic Qualification	115
4.6	Group Statistics of Gender on Online Learning Environment	116
4.7	Independent Sample Test of Gender on Online Learning Environment	116
4.8	Group Statistics of Academic Qualification Mean Differences on Online Learning Environment	117
4.9	Independent Sample Test of Academic Qualification on Online Learning Environment	118
4.10	Group Statistics of Gender on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	118
4.11	Independent Sample Test of Gender on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	119
4.12	Group Statistics of Academic Qualification on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	120
4.13	Independent Sample Test of Academic Qualification on Lecturers' Assessment Practice	120
4.14	Group Statistics of Gender on Students' Writing Skills	121
4.15	Independent Sample Test of Gender on Students' Writing Skills	121
4.16	Group Statistics of Academic Qualification on Students' Writing Skills	122
4.17	Independent Sample Test of Academic Qualification on Students' Writing Skills	123
4.18	Group Statistics of Gender on Students' Plagiarism Practices	123
4.19	Independent Sample Test of Gender on Students' Plagiarism Practices	124

4.20	Group Statistics of Academic Qualification on Students' Plagiarism Practices	125
4.21	Independent Sample Test of Academic Qualification on Students' Plagiarism Practices	125
4.22	Coefficients of the Relationship between Online Learning Environment and Students' Plagiarism Practices	126
4.23	Coefficients of the Relationship between Lecturers' Assessment Practice and Students' Plagiarism Practices	127
4.24	Coefficients of the Relationship between Students' Writing Skills and Students' Plagiarism Practices	128
4.25	Model Summary of the Influence of Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, and Students' Writing Skills on Students' Plagiarism Practices	129
4.26	ANOVA of the Influence of Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, and Students' Writing Skills on Students' Plagiarism Practices	130
4.27	Coefficients of the Influence of Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, and Students' Writing Skills on Students' Plagiarism Practices	131
4.28	Supported Extract for Subtheme of Reflection	134
4.29	Supported Extract for Subtheme of Language Assessment	137
4.30	Supported Extract for Subtheme of Norms toward Plagiarism	140

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE NO.	TITLE	PAGE
1.1	Theoretical Framework	14
1.2	Conceptual Framework	17
3.1	Procedure of the questionnaire's design and validation	77
3.2	Structure Calibration Scale of 40 Persons	87
3.3	Structure Calibration Scale of 35 Respondents	88
3.4	Data Collection Procedure	90
4.1	Thematic Map of the Most Dominant Preferred Subtheme on the Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices	133

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFL	-	English is taught as a Foreign Language
OLE	-	Online Learning Environment
LAP	-	Lecturers' Assessment Practice
SWS	-	Students' Writing Skills
SPP	-	Students' Plagiarism Practices

LIST OF SYMBOLS

'	-	Apostrophe
[]	-	Brackets
:	-	Colon
,	-	Comma
—	-	Dash
!	-	Exclamation Mark
-	-	Hyphen
()	-	Parentheses
.	-	Period
?	-	Question Mark
“ ”	-	Quotation Mark
;	-	Semicolon
/	-	Slash
s	-	required sample size
N	-	Population size
df	-	Degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion
p	-	Probability level
β	-	Beta
r	-	Pearson Correlation
**	-	Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
*	-	Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
A	Metadata Analysis	184
B	Questionnaire	203
C	Krejcie and Morgan Table	211
D	Rating Scale Instrument Quality Criteria, Standardized Mean Square, and Standard Deviation	212
E	Lecturers' Perception Level ON OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP using Rasch Measurement Model	213
F	Multiple Regression	215
G	Interview Protocol	216
H	Details Nvivo 10	217
I	Thematic Analysis Process	218
J	Themes and Subthemes from Thematic Analysis Process	222
K	Approval Letter from Indonesian Government for Conducting Research	224

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Although online learning provides enormous advantages, it is not always regarded as an alternative method because inadequate equipment can weaken student learning. This technology should be appropriately used because students and teachers have individual outlooks on the teaching and learning process. The classroom environment not only expects and demands enhanced performance but also develops creativity to build and original and honest culture. In the academic environment, honesty is essential to encouraging integrity (Sutherland-Smith, 2008).

However, there is persistent worry by lecturers in a country where English is not the official language that a lack of writing ability might lead students to academic dishonesty. Some students are deficient in academic writing although English as Foreign Language (EFL) lecturers may have taught the required skills and students may have been able to pass necessary courses. Lecturers hope to improve student academic writing, but they use the established rating on assessment practice. Hence, what the lecturer expects from the student is not always the same as what the student achieves from the lecturer, especially in academic writing.

Finding valuable ways to develop student writing skills is a principle concern for EFL teachers (Lee and Schallert, 2008). Nevertheless, a lack of writing skill among EFL students might be attributed to poor teaching, curricular constraints, a lack of strict ratings, and assessment. Also, an undemanding breakdown on the part of lecturer

to teach the basic skills for creating the original works might influence students' plagiarism practices. Whereas teaching techniques and content have changed over the years, a far greater cause of student inability to write without engaging in plagiarism may be due to a lack of writing assessment practices. Rating and grading students' work and finding methods of responding to students writing might be the most stressful aspects of teaching for many lecturers. After lecturers return students' work, they might have persistent uncertainties in fulfilling their students' needs. Lecturers' dissatisfaction might improve when they become conscious that most of their students confess they do not think about their assessment. Students' habit of unconsciously considering lecturers' assessments might be helpful in strengthening lecturers' awareness of students' writing ability.

Lecturers should concern themselves with a high-quality instruction plan as opposed to e-learning alternatives as a direct option to highlight quality rather than quantity. However, highlighting the quality of student writing in an online learning environment requires instructors to consider technology use for minimizing opportunities for academic dishonesty. However, Sutherland-smith (2008) stated that locating internet source material is often laborious and time-consuming. However, it is expected for teachers to use a range of approaches to recognize academic dishonesty using technology, such as the *Google* or *Dogpile* search engines, into which they type in "suspect" phrases or references.

Preventing student from plagiarism practices is not enough to use technology for plagiarism checks only. Townley and Parsell (2005) stated that it is a foolish solution to plagiarism practices in an internet environment to use only a specific technology. It is risky to refer to *turnitin.com* as an ideal solution; even if it provides valuable guidance and some supportive tools for both lecturers and students. Large classrooms, casualization of university teaching, and a shift from universities to economic procedures weaken scholar society. The solution to internet-promoted academic dishonesty should concern lecturers and students far more than student misuse of online resources. Solutions to internet plagiarism practices should focus on the prevention of plagiarism practice to strengthen academic integrity, not on the plagiarism practices itself. In contrast, Jones and Moore (2010) revealed that *Turnitin*, in general, is a vital tool in the struggle for anti-plagiarism practices and an ideal

prevention application. However, strong-minded student is capable on manipulating the implementation of the software. Therefore, academic staff who uses *Turnitin* must be aware of similarity in the form of ideas on papers submitted to *Turnitin*. Apparently, high similarity scores between submitted materials and resource materials indicates a cause for concern. However, low scores are not a guarantee free from plagiarism, so it also a cause of concern for lecturers. Eventually, academic staff and professor is required to cautiously continue all forms of plagiarism practices.

Whatever the assessment, EFL lecturers may also argue that learning environments have significant effect on students' plagiarism practices. Students may engage in plagiarism practices due to the online learning process, thereby plagiarism incidences might influence the academic environment. Therefore, stimulating a good educational atmosphere to be conducive to learning might encourages students to avoid plagiarism practices. Moreover, how EFL lecturers assess students' writing skills is also an aspect of the learning process as a positive learning environment to stimulate students to respect ethics in an academic environment.

One of the primary goals of academic writing in an EFL setting is to develop EFL students with honor codes that avoid plagiarism practices (McCabe and Trevino, 1993). Therefore, an academic writing course requires students to engage actively and intensively in academic writing practices. Students are expected not only to pass the writing course by completing writing course assignments, but they are also expected to practice writing skills in thesis writing as well as publish their scientific works either at national or international level. The publication policy is required for students' study accomplishment, students' future career, and university's reputation. Expectation of publication has been increased both in quality and quantity at the university and research institution. Honesty in writing, which demands the students be conscious of plagiarism practices, is one of quality standard of scientific publication.

1.2 Background of Study

The number of studies addressed the influence on students' plagiarism practices are limited. Hu and Lei (2015) studied the gender-relations to the disciplinary background to influence the perception of bachelor students on plagiarism. Male students with soft disciplinary backgrounds perceived higher rates of avoiding plagiarism practice than their counterparts. Female students with soft disciplines background had a similar perception of plagiarism practices. Eriksson and McGee (2015) examined the plagiarism practices of university and college students. The results suggested that males viewed plagiarism practices as less severe and suggested that more proactive strategies were required to prevent student plagiarism practices.

Can and Walker (2011) focused on student perceptions and attitudes towards written feedback for academic writing at the doctorate level. This study explained the distinctiveness of written feedback from written feedback providers (reviewers) and characterized the relationship of some factors in feedback practices. This study revealed that doctorate students preferred written feedback on content, organization, and grammar as well as other factors. Also, this research portrayed that doctorate students preferred balanced negative and positive comments in the feedback provided by reviewers.

Coughlin (2015) studied plagiarism on regular Master students based on perspective with pedagogical, ethical and social economic implications. When various forces ensure that cheating is viewed as normal while detection and punishment are infrequent, many Master students engaged in plagiarism practices. Moreover, some universities provided inadequate training on strategies to prevent plagiarism. Many professors have little or no awareness on detecting student plagiarism practices, and they failed to take appropriate pedagogical instruction to prevent their students from engaging in plagiarism.

Hanna (2009) focused on writing apprehension and student perceptions of particular comments by teachers. Written comments might be equally significant to increasing student comfort and reducing student apprehension in writing. This study

places classroom teaching as essential to assisting students in the success of their writing efforts. In line with Sommers (2006), who was in the four year study of 400 hundred students found that instructor comments in final drafts frequently become the single space in writing instruction when students and teachers collaborate through feedback. Likewise, Lam (2013) focused on EFL student perceptions on writing ability, text improvement, and feedback using limited numbers of EFL pre-university students in Hong Kong with data collection concerned with the perceptions of students regarding their portfolio experiences.

Montgomery and Baker (2007) studied the writing issues in the form of students' perception, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. The results of the study suggested that students received more than their teachers supposed in their feedback. Most students perceived that they were pleased with the amount of feedback in all areas of assessment. It is also suggested that students felt that teachers provided feedback based on student preferences or understanding. However, the limitation of this finding is that the emphasis was on local issues of grammar and mechanics on all drafts that may suggest to students to prioritize local errors. Moreover, theorists debate on how much feedback to give on local issues in a second language writing composition course, where the focus is on learning principles of composition.

Rovai (2000) and Beyth-Marom *et al.* (2003) focused on the internet learning environment as a fundamental aspect of distance learning. Rovai (2000) stated that the approach of assessment principles are implemented to guide student assessment in a traditional learning environment remains unchanged in an online learning environment. The assessment approaches in a traditional classroom is inadequate for distance education due to a lack of control over assessment conditions, available resources, and distance learner isolation. It is essential that lecturers have an obvious underlying principle for assessing students through certain methods as well as the methods for lecturers to interpret student performance.

Furthermore, Beyth-Marom *et al.* (2003) stated that an instructional designer should suit the learning environment to whoever will benefit more from each possible component or delivery medium. However, this study was restricted to achievement

variables and values. Therefore, other variables that could affect preferences for a specific learning environment should be studied, such as personality and cognitive variables. When computers and the internet will part of the learning environment in school and at home, working with computers would be one of the tools for a vibrant, friendly tool-kit for distance learners.

Jackson (2006) found that students need extra instruction and practice in how to paraphrase correctly. Students are deficient in this aptitude when reading sources or materials and writing scientific papers, especially in citing and referencing properly. Students seemed lack of understanding on the concept of synthesizing sources by composing it in their own words is one of elements of paraphrasing. Some instructors have started using tutorials in their regular classroom teaching. These instructors focus on providing examples of paraphrasing tutorials and use open-ended quiz questions on paraphrasing as part given assignments. This study needs further investigation to conclude the usefulness of this method.

The partnership between instructors and the library is remarkable for developing instructional resources for classroom use. Plagiarism, paraphrasing, and citing sources are presented in this tutorial, but ethics on instruction is lacking. Furthermore, Cumming (2001) studied the orientations that instructors adapt when conceptualizing curricula for ESL/EFL writing instruction. The adaptation would be appeared and could influence how teachers assessing students' achievement. However, this study did not provide the design to investigate this matter, yet distinctions between specific purpose and general-purpose approaches to assessments have emerged as a notable trend across contexts and program types internationally.

Yugianingrum (2008) found that there are many academic papers, including EFL undergraduate theses that show low awareness of appropriate citing practices and poor supervisor attitudes toward the importance of citing other works properly. These problems may even threaten successful completion for most students. Increased requirements and the aforementioned reported problems make it a necessity to successfully facilitate and encourage student academic writing skills. The study comprised a textual analysis of bachelor theses to describe the type and manner of source citations and to interpret similarities and differences based on primary data

analysis in both the literature and the linguistics field of study. He finally concluded that the authors of literature and linguistic theses violated general conventions about citation style, lack of citing skill, and low supervision awareness from the university.

Cahyono (2009) concluded that not all Indonesian universities have strong commitments to avoiding plagiarism. Octaberlina (2009) argued that plagiarism continues in Indonesia because students are required to adhere uniformly to a thesis format, but the government has failed to require regulations dealing with plagiarism. The harsh prevalence of plagiarism encouraged Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia (2010) to issue the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia on the Prevention and Combating Plagiarism in Higher Education. This regulation was issued in an attempt to avoid plagiarism; however, the contribution of this policy on student plagiarism practices needs further study. Indeed, the success of the regulation might be determined by lecturers understanding plagiarism.

Kutieleh and Adiningrum (2011) stated that lecturer understanding of plagiarism is inconsistent, which inhibits student creative thinking and academic writing quality. Hence, the Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi (2012) requires students to be published in a scientific journal for a bachelor degree, a national scientific journal for a master degree, and International Journal for the doctorate level. However, this needs further study to prove that this policy of getting published either at the national or international level can encourage plagiarism practice prevention. Manalu (2013) argued that student knowledge uncertainty towards plagiarism necessitates more attention by lecturers to teach paraphrase and quotation skills to develop student academic writing. Disregarding first writing skills and writing publication culture in an endeavor to encourage plagiarism practice prevention may make the student plagiarism virus more infectious in future academic settings. Previous studies might not represent the factors that influence student plagiarism practices due to different English language areas, online learning environments, assessment practices, and writing ability. These problems are located in a limited number of studies that inform that practices require further explanation regarding some issues on plagiarism. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the influence of

Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practices, and Student Writing Skill on Student Plagiarism Practices.

1.3 Statement of Problems

The reorganized elaboration of human awareness in an advancing environmental matrix that emphasizes personality theory to encompass a time-based agreement of the capabilities of movement, inequity, worth, adjustment, alteration, integration, and shift. In the classroom environment, teachers should integrate students into connection zones with essential ability platforms in favor of encouragement emphasis (Moos, 1980). Teachers are supposed to confirm that they sustain student productively in online learning by presenting enormous prospects and huge amounts of information. This classroom environment is required for improve work as well as creating innovation and individual growth.

The Indonesian government through Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia (2010) responded to the plagiarism issue by issuing the Regulation of the Ministry of National Education of the Republic of Indonesia on the Prevention and Combating Plagiarism in Higher Education. This regulation is expected to avoid incidences of plagiarism. Higher education in Indonesia encourages university students at all level as the Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi (2012) requires students to get published in a scientific journal for a bachelor degree, a national scientific journal for a master degree, and an International Journal for doctoral level degree. This policy aims at promoting students to get published under lecturer assessment to endorse an academic writing culture in an academic environment. Indonesia has experienced many failures in academic dishonesty. Many academic papers, including EFL undergraduate theses, show low awareness of appropriate citing practices and poor supervisor attitudes toward the importance of citing other works correctly (Yugianingrum, 2008). However, not all Indonesian universities are committed to avoiding plagiarism (Cahyono, 2005).

Plagiarism in Indonesia exists as a result of student requirements to adhere uniformly to a thesis format, with a failure by the government to successfully impose regulations to deal with plagiarism (Octaberlina, 2009). Adiningrum (2011) stated that missed cultural understandings and inconsistencies in lecturer understanding on plagiarism inhibit student creative thinking and academic writing. Student plagiarism practices seemed to be influenced by a lack of student understanding of plagiarism and academic writing teaching, especially in properly citing and quoting. Manalu (2013) revealed that the lack of student knowledge on plagiarism requires an endorsement of teaching paraphrasing and quotations to develop student writing skills and to promote plagiarism practice prevention.

This encouragement does not seem to affect student plagiarism practices. The lack of student insight on plagiarism practices indicates a need for more studies on online learning environment, lecture assessment practice, and student writing skills. A lack plagiarism practice prevention as well as lecturer feedback on student writing seems to exacerbate plagiarism practices. Hence, this study aims to determine the perception of EFL lecturers on Online Learning Environment (OLE), Lecturer Assessment Practice (LAP), Students Writing Skills (SWS), and Student Plagiarism Practices (SPS). Differences based on gender and academic qualification on EFL lecturer perceptions towards OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP were examined. The relationship and influence of independent variables (OLE, LAP, SWS) and the dependent variable (SPP) were also investigated. Finally, this study aims to find out EFL lecturer perceptions of the student learning experience on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study aims to receive current information from lecturers regarding the factors affecting student plagiarism practices. The objectives of this study are:

- (i) To determine the EFL lecturers' perception on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices.
- (ii) To examine differences on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practice based on gender and academic qualification.
- (iii) To investigate the relationship between independent variable (Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills) and dependent variable (Students' Plagiarism Practices).
- (iv) To find out which variables are good predictors of plagiarism practices.

1.5 Questions of the Study

Based on the objectives of the study above, the researcher formulated the study questions as follows:

- (i) What is the level of EFL lecturers' perception on Online Learning Environment, Lectures' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students Plagiarism Practices?
- (ii) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturer's perception on Online Learning Environment based on gender and academic qualification?
- (iii) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Lecturers' Assessment Practice based on gender and academic qualification?
- (iv) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Students' Writing Skills based on gender and academic qualification?
- (v) Is there any significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Students' Plagiarism Practices based on gender and academic qualification?

- (vi) Is there any significant relationship between Online Learning Environment and Students' Plagiarism Practices?
- (vii) Is there any significant relationship between Lecturers' Assessment Practice and Students' Plagiarism Practices?
- (viii) Is there any significant relationship between Students Writing Skills and Students' Plagiarism Practices?
- (ix) Is there any significant influence between the independent variable (Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills) and the dependent variable (Students' Plagiarism Practices)?
- (x) What is the EFL lecturers' perception based on students' experiential learning on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices?

1.6 Hypothesis

- (i) Hypothesis null 1: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Online Learning Environment based on gender.
- (ii) Hypothesis null 2: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Online Learning Environment based on academic qualification.
- (iii) Hypothesis null 3: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Lecturers' Assessment Practice based on gender.
- (iv) Hypothesis null 4: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Lecturers' Assessment Practice based on academic qualification.
- (v) Hypothesis null 5: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Students' Writing Skills based on gender.

- (vi) Hypothesis null 6: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Students' Writing Skill based on academic qualification.
- (vii) Hypothesis null 7: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Students' Plagiarism Practices based on gender.
- (viii) Hypothesis null 8: There is no significant mean difference of EFL lecturers' perception on Students' Plagiarism Practices based on academic qualification.
- (ix) Hypothesis null 9: There is no significant relationship between Online Learning Environment and Students' Plagiarism Practices.
- (x) Hypothesis null 10: There is no significant relationship between Lecturers' Assessment Practice and Students' Plagiarism Practices.
- (xi) Hypothesis null 11: There is no significant relationship between Students Writing Skills and Students' Plagiarism Practices.
- (xii) Hypothesis null 12: There is no significant influence between the independent variable (Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills) and the dependent variable (Students' Plagiarism Practices).

1.7 Scope of the Study

This study determined the perception of EFL lecturers on Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practice, Students Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. This study also examined differences on EFL lecturer perceptions on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP based on gender and academic qualification. The relationship and influence of the independent variables (OLE, LAP, SWS) with the dependent variable (SPP) were the main issues, which were investigated in this study. EFL lecturer perceptions from student experiential learning on Online Learning

Environment, Lecturers Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices were also found out in this study. This study implemented a concurrent mixed method design with questionnaire and interview protocol instruments. MNSQ fit statistics and inferential statistics were applied for the quantitative part, and thematic analysis was used for the qualitative part.

1.8. The Significance of the Study

This study is expected to be enormously worthwhile for readers, especially for EFL lecturers who wish to obtain information on Online Learning Environment, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Students' Writing Skills, and Students' Plagiarism Practices. Readers can gain information on differences from EFL lecturers' perception on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP based on gender and academic qualification. The reader is also expected to get information on the relationship and the influence of OLE, LAP, and SWS on SPP.

By reading this thesis, readers are also expected to find information on new references from the questionnaire on online Learning Environments, Lecturers' Assessment Practice, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. Because this study uses the mixed method, the reader is also expected to get an overview of the new protocol interview on plagiarism practices. The theme that emerged from the qualitative methods in this thesis can be used as a reference or preliminary conceptual framework about the factors that cause students to engage in plagiarism. This study also reckoned the self-reflection of EFL lecturers on the effort which they assess student scientific works to discourage plagiarism engagement. This study is also a conceptual framework for the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia, especially for *Universitas Negeri Makassar* to nurture endeavors on plagiarism deterrence.

1.9 Theoretical Framework

The theory of Murray in the late Murray (2007) on personality exploration underlies this study. The exploration of personality theory emphasizes the reorganized elaboration of human perception in a moving environmental matrix comprised of a temporal unity of motile, discrimination, value, assimilation, adaptation, integration, differentiation, and reproduction. In the context of the classroom environment, teachers should integrate students into relationship areas with necessary skill programs by emphasizing task oriented support (Moos, 1980). Teachers should ensure that they support students efficiently dealing with online learning sources, which offer enormous opportunities and information (McKimm *et al.*, 2003). This type of classroom environment not only expects and demands better performance but augments creativity to create original and personal development. In the context of examinations, factors affecting Plagiarism Practices, Online Learning Environments, Lecturer Assessment Practices, and Students Writing Skills were four vital issues.




Figure 1.1: Theoretical Framework

Murray's theory on personality exploration is the primary foundation for this study. Exploration, as mentioned in exploration in personality theory, provides an essential emphasis on systematically redefining human perception in a dynamic environment. The presence of a brief unitary time determines the dynamic of the environment. Differences lead people to the process of adaptation, assimilation, integration, and even reproduction, which characterizes dynamism. What is interesting in the theory of exploitation is the element of value. In this case, dynamism is also highly determined by the existence of elements of value. A person who values an object will determine a pro and con attitude that can, of course, encourage the emergence of integration, assimilation, or even discrimination.

In the context of the classroom environment, teachers should promote integration principles. Teachers must strive to realize necessary writing skills with the accomplishment of task completion (Moos, 1980). The existence of task targets is provides learning encouragement to achieve desired targets. However, Teachers also should fully support students to efficiently access online learning resources (McKimm *et al.*, 2003). The presence of online learning resources, of course, offers excellent opportunities and unlimited information access. A classroom environment in the midst of an online environment is undoubtedly expected to produce a much better output and increased creativity to create original scientific works and personal self-development to prevent plagiarism practices.

1.10 Conceptual Framework

Some theories underpin the conceptual framework of this study. The concept of the Online Learning Environment in this study comes from an exploration in personality theory by the late Murray (2007), an evaluation of classroom learning environment by Moos (1980), and ABC learning and teaching by McKimm *et al.* (2003). Exploration in personality theory emphasizes human perception, which is regularly elaborated in a dynamic environment that has an element of integration and value (the late Murray, 2007). Integration and fundamental values should emphasize task-oriented support (Moos, 1980). This is so that teachers guarantee support for

accessing online reading resources (McKimm *et al.*, 2003). For the Online Learning Environment, the researcher used a questionnaire developed by Walker and Fraser (2005), Clayton (2007), and Taylor and Maor (2014). This variable consists of relevance, reflection, interaction, collaboration, tutor support, peer support, making sense, instructor support, authentic learning, active learning, student autonomy, computer competence, and material environment.

The theory of “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment” and “ABC Learning and Teaching” underpins Lecturer Assessment Practices in this study. In the context of evaluating classroom learning environments, teachers should integrate students into relationship areas with necessary skills programs by emphasizing task oriented support (Moos, 1980). In ABC learning and teaching theory, teachers should ensure that they support students in efficiently dealing with learning information that enables students to access broad information sources. These theories comprise the basis of a questionnaire that meets teacher elements of assessment to ensure adequate skill in doing a task. Specifically, the Trinity Inclusive Curriculum (2012) focusing on written work assessment and Brown and Hudson (1998) focusing on alternative assessment of language. These two issues are considered related to the form of assessment by EFL lecturers.

The variable of “Student Writing Skills” is also underpinned by the theory of “Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment”. It is advisable for teachers to integrate students with relationship spaces using necessary skills programs with task-oriented support (Moos, 1980). Accordingly, the primary skill for accomplishing this task is writing skill. The researcher modified the variable of Student Writing Skills from some studies and rubrics (Brown and Bailey, 1984; Tullos, 2014; Arizona Department of Education, 2011; Trauth, 2007; Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013). Student Writing Skills includes organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, mechanics, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing, summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty.

The variable of “Student Plagiarism Practices” is underpinned by the theory of Murray (the late Murray, 2007) and ABC Learning and Teaching (McKimm *et al.*, 2003). Personality exploration highlights value and reproduction. The better students

perceive value, the higher the quality of reproduction regarding a given task. Moreover, in ABC Learning and Teaching theory, teachers should provide explicit support to help student access substantial learning resources while emphasizing academic integrity to avoid plagiarism practices. In this study, the researcher modified a questionnaire provided by Mavrinac *et al.* (2010), who studied attitudes toward plagiarism.




Figure 1.2: Conceptual Framework

1.11 Definition of Terms

The definition of terms deals with a brief explanation of the specific abbreviations for all the variables in this study. The researcher provides the abbreviation of EFL to avoid ambiguity with ESL. The Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices are briefly described as variables in this study.

1.11.1 English as a Foreign Language

EFL in this study context is taught as a compulsory subject at academic settings (Mistar, 2014), but it is not an official language. It is commonly accepted that EFL is attributed to the position of English in countries where English is not the official language (Broughton *et al.*, 2002), but it is still taught in an academic setting. English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2014) is defined as “English as taught to people whose English is not the main language and where English is not the official or main language for the public in a country.” English in Indonesia is not used as a communication tool as it is not the primary language. However, in Indonesia, English is a mandatory subject for in secondary schools to enable students to learn the four necessary language skills regarding listening, reading, writing, and speaking.

1.11.2 Online Learning Environment

The Online Learning Environment (OLE) in this study is student learning conditions and the way they influence how students successfully learn using computers and courses provided on the internet. The Online Learning Environment is derived from e-learning and environment. E-learning is learning done by studying at home using computers and courses provided on the internet (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2014b). The environment is defined by Cambridge Dictionaries Online

(2014c) as “*the conditions that people live or work in and influence how people feel or how effectively people can work.*” The potential for online learning in an academic setting has grown. Students can now access knowledge from textbooks and from lesson materials from outside the school. Teachers and students can access extensive information from libraries around the world. The online environment can provide information on various media as the internet is an extensive library. Students and teachers can improve learning in the classroom by accessing information from various sources on the internet through websites or other education providers. Pearson and Trinidad (2005) studied that educators need learning theories knowledge, best practice models in designing and implementing learning online, and feedback in specifying attempts to match the favourite of students’ learning environment. Furthermore, Walker and Fraser (2005); Clayton (2007) revealed that distance education is an essential learning environment. However, Taylor and Maor (2000a) ensemble teachers, lecturers, and researchers as well as for those who concern on the online academic role to promote the university teaching reform.

1.11.3 Lecturer Assessment Practice

The Term Lecturer Assessment Practices in this study is an approach that necessitates students to achieve or produce something before examinations to enhance the ability of students to master specific subjects. Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2018) defines assess as “*to decide the quality or importance of something.*” Lecturers are expected to allow students to be assessed in the standard classroom. Lecturers should provide students assignments that correspond to crucial pedagogical performance. Moreover, lecturers should highlight the process of learning to produce and tap into higher stage thinking and analytic skills. For better assessment practices, lecturers also should afford information about both the strengths and weakness of points raised by students. Brown (2001) reported that assessment principles, in general, might include assessment shapes learning, it is, therefore, changing learning must be in line with changing the assessment method. Brown (2004) describes the relationship among the reasonable cost, proper time limit, flexible to administer, and time-efficient to provide score or evaluation. This in line with National Council of

Teachers of English (2013) that pedagogical and curricular goals enlighten the best assessment practice whereby teachers design assessments based on the context of assessment in classroom. Trinity Inclusive Curriculum (2012) concerned on the understanding of the coursework, skill to explain, evaluate, reflect, and apply theory as well as research skills, for instance, the ability to learn, assess, organize, and synthesize resources in an academic setting.

1.11.4 Student Writing Skills

A primary meaning of writing as defined by Cambridge Dictionaries Online (2014b) is *“a person’s style or forming letters and words with a pen or pencil, or something is written. Skill in this research is one dimension of knowledge saving, which is expanded extensively and deeply through practice.”* Thus, writing skills is a fundamental skill that can be obtained in school and is vital means of written communication. Unfortunately, students often ignore this skill. Writing skills is a meaningful way to express thoughts while communicating ideas and views to others. In this study, writing skills are very dependent on mastery of the elements of writing. These writing elements are organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing, summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty. Helping students to develop their writing skills is expected to avoid plagiarism practices. The students writing skill in this study is related to some studies and rubrics (Arizona Department of Education, 2011; Association of American College and Universities, 2013; Brown and Bailey, 1984; Trauth, 2007; Tullos, 2014). Students writing skill includes organization, content, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and mechanics, vocabulary, referencing, citing, paraphrasing and summarizing, quotation, synthesizing, and novelty.

1.11.5 Student Plagiarism Practice

The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (2014) defines plagiarism as *“the act of using another person’s words or ideas without giving credit to that person.”*

Plagiarism in this study is using other people's words, but with a lack of quotations, improper citations, or poor paraphrasing. Plagiarism occurs when someone uses previous descriptions of a research method, but fails to quote or cite their sources. Plagiarism also occurs if someone translates a part of a paper from a foreign language, but she/he has no idea what to write. A self-published work that does not provide citations is also plagiarism. Plagiarism also happens due to the lack of understanding of what plagiarism is. Some students also are tempted to plagiarize because they are in an environment where many other students are doing it. Mavrinac *et al.* (2010) and Pupovac *et al.* (2010) advised that ostensible formula, academic integrity, and awareness of the possible relationships impresses to begin the research. Ma *et al.* (2008) described the impact of the internet in the learning environment from the negative (plagiarism) and positive aspect (plagiarism deterrent).

1.12 Summary

The limited number of studies on plagiarism practices indicates that this is an area that requires further investigation. Therefore, this study aims to measure the perception of EFL lecturers on Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practices, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. This study also investigates difference based on gender and academic qualification on EFL lecturer perceptions on OLE, LAP, SWS, and SPP. This study examines the relationship and the influence of independent variables (OLE, LAP, and SWS) on the dependent variable (SPP). Finally, this study also explored EFL lecturer perceptions from student experiential learning on Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practice, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. This study is expected to provide information on new references concerning the questionnaire for Online Learning Environment, Lecturer Assessment Practice, Student Writing Skills, and Student Plagiarism Practices. The reader is expected to get an overview of a new protocol interview on plagiarism practices. The themes that emerged through the qualitative methods in this thesis can be a reference or preliminary conceptual framework for readers about how factors influence students to engage in plagiarism.

The conceptual framework of this study is underpinned by the concept of an Online Learning Environment as an exploration of Murray's personality theory, "*Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment*" theory, and "*ABC Learning and Teaching*". Lecturers' Assessment Practice is underpinned by the theory of "*Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment*" and "*ABC Learning and Teaching*." The variable of "Students' Writing Skills" is also underpinned by the theory of "*Evaluating Classroom Learning Environment*." The variable of "Students' Plagiarism Practices" is underpinned by Murray's personality theory and "*ABC Learning and Teaching*".

EFL in this study is a compulsory subject at academic setting, but it is not an official language. The Online Learning Environment (OLE) in this study is the conditions of students who learn on a computer and the way this influences how they learn. Lecturer assessment practices in this study is an approach that necessitates students to achieve or produce something before examinations to enhance the ability of students to master certain subjects. Writing skills is a basic skill that can be obtained at school and is a vital means of written communication. Plagiarism in this study is using other people's words, but with a lack of quotations, improper citation, or poor paraphrasing. The next chapter discusses the literature review of this study.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Z., Simun, M., & Mohammad, J. (2008). Malaysian university students' attitudes to academic dishonesty and business ethics. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(2), 149–160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790802040721>
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Aldridge, A., & Levine, K. (2001). *Surveying the Social World*. Buckingham - Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Alred, G. J., Brusaw, C. T., & Oliu, W. E. (2009). *Handbook of Technical Writing*. Writing (Ninth Edit). New York: Saint Martin's Press Inc.
- Alwin, D. F., & Krosnick, J. A. (1991). The Reliability of Survey Attitude Measurement: The Influence of Question and Respondent Attributes. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 20(1), 139–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124191020001005>
- American Heritage Dictionary. (2011). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Anderson, E. L., Steen, E., & Stavropoulos, V. (2017). Internet use and Problematic Internet Use: a systematic review of longitudinal research trends in adolescence and emergent adulthood. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 22(4), 430–454. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2016.1227716>
- Anderson, I. (2009). Avoiding plagiarism in academic writing. *Nursing Standard (Royal College of Nursing (Great Britain) : 1987)*, 23(18), 35–37.

<https://doi.org/10.7748/ns2009.01.23.18.35.c6739>

- Anderson, J. O. (1989). Evaluation of Student Achievement: Teacher Practices and Educational Measurement. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 35(2), 123–133.
- Anderson, R. E., & Obenshain, S. S. (1994). Cheating by students: findings, reflections, and remedies. *Academic Medicine : Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 69(5), 323–332.
- Arizona Department of Education. (2011). Rubric: Summary of a Paragraph. Arizona Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.azed.gov/no-child-left-behind/files/2011/11/th-109a.pdf>
- Armatas, C., Holt, D., & Rice, M. (2003). Impacts of an online-supported, resource-based learning environment: does one size fit all? *Distance Education*, 24(2), 141–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158791032000127446>
- Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381034>
- Association of American College and Universities. (2013). Creative Thinking Value Rubric. Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/CreativeThinking.pdf>
- Austin, M. J., & Brown, L. D. (1999). Internet Plagiarism: Developing Strategies to Curb Student Academic Dishonesty. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 2(1), 21–33. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(99\)00004-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(99)00004-4)
- Azari, M. H. (2017). Effect of weblog-based process approach on EFL learners' writing performance and autonomy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(6), 529–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1329214>
- Azrilah, A. A. (2010). *Rasch model fundamentals: scale construct and measurement structure*. Integrated Advance Planning Sdn Bhd.

- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, R., & Garner, M. (2010). Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(2), 187–198.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562511003620019>
- Bailey, S. (2011). *Academic Writing: A Handbook for International Students third edition*. Education (Third Edit). T & F Books UK.
- Baldwin, D. C., Daugherty, S. R., Rowley, B. D., & Schwarz, M. D. (1996). Cheating in medical school: a survey of second-year students at 31 schools. *Academic Medicine : Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 71(3), 267–273. Retrieved from
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8607927>
- Barrett, E., & Lally, V. (1999). Gender differences in an on-line learning environment. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 15(1), 48–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2729.1999.151075.x>
- Bartholomew, K. W. (2004). Computer literacy: is the emperor still exposed after all these years? *Journal of Computing Sciences in Colleges*, 323–331.
<https://doi.org/jcsc> 20,1
- Beldarrain, Y. (2006). Distance Education Trends: Integrating new technologies to foster student interaction and collaboration. *Journal of Distance Education*, 27(2), 139–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910600789498>
- Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(1), 21–40.
- Beyth-Marom, R., Chajut, E., Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (2003). Internet-assisted versus traditional distance learning environments: factors affecting students' preferences. *Computers & Education*, 41(1), 65–76.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1315\(03\)00026-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1315(03)00026-5)

- Bianco, M., Collis, B., Cooke, A., & Margaryan, A. (2002). Instructor Support for New Learning Approaches Involving Technology. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 6(2), 129–148.
- Biberman-Shalev, L. (2018). Personal blogs or communal blogs? Pre-service teachers' perceptions regarding the contribution of these two platforms to their professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 69, 253–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.10.006>
- Bird, C. M. (2005). How I Stopped Dreading and Learned to Love Transcription. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(2), 226–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800404273413>
- Black, M. M., Walker, S. P., Fernald, L. C. H., Andersen, C. T., DiGirolamo, A. M., Lu, C., ... Grantham-McGregor, S. (2017). Early childhood development coming of age: science through the life course. *The Lancet*, 389(10064), 77–90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(16\)31389-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7)
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2006). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. Granada Learning.
- Blackwell, J., & Martin, J. (2011). *A Scientific Approach to Scientific Writing. ReVision*. New York, NY: Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9788-3>
- Bond, T. G., & Fox, C. M. (2015). *Applying the Rasch Model*. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Boone, W. J., Staver, J. R., & Yale, M. S. (2014). *Rasch Analysis in the Human Sciences*.
- Bott, E. (2010). Favourites and others: reflexivity and the shaping of subjectivities and data in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794109356736>
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. Sage.

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(May 2015), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, A. D. (2002). Making Sense of Inquiry Sensemaking. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(1), no-no. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00172>
- Brown, A. D., Stacey, P., & Nandhakumar, J. (2008). Making sense of sensemaking narratives. *Human Relations*, 61(8), 1035–1062.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094858>
- Brown, G. (2001). *Assessment: A Guide for Lecturers. Assessment* (the third). LTSN generic Centre. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/48752387>
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices*. Pearson Education. Retrieved from
<https://books.google.com.my/books?id=nWZYAQAACAAJ>
- Brown, J. D., & Bailey, K. M. (1984). A Categorical Instrument for Scoring Second and Language Writing Skills. *Language Learning*, 34(4), 21–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1984.tb00350.x>
- Brown, J. D., & Hudson, T. (1998). The Alternatives in Language Assessment. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(4), 653. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587999>
- Cahyono, B. Y. (2005). How Australian and Indonesian Universities Treat Plagiarism: A Comparative Study. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 12(3).
- Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. C. B. R. C. Calfee (Ed.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 709–725). London, England: Prentice Hall International.
- Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2014a). Assess - definition in the American English Dictionary - Cambridge Dictionaries Online. Retrieved October 18, 2014, from <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/american-english/english-as->

a-foreign-language

Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2014b). e-learning. Retrieved from
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/e-learning>

Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2014c). Environment. Retrieved from
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/environment>

Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2014d). writing - definition in the American
 English Dictionary - Cambridge Dictionaries Online. Retrieved October 18,
 2014, from <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/american-english/writing>

Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2018). Assess. Retrieved from
<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/assess>

Cambridge University Press. (2008). *Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary
 Reference Book with CD-ROM*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from
<https://books.google.com.my/books?id=pqlRO2jdI2gC>

Can, G., & Walker, A. (2011). A Model for Doctoral Students' Perceptions and
 Attitudes Toward Written Feedback for Academic Writing. *Research in
 Higher Education*, 52(5), 508–536. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-010-9204-1>

Cargill, M., & O'Connor, P. (2009). *Writing scientific research articles: strategy
 and steps*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Carless, D. (2009). Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assessment
 & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(1), 79–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801895786>

Carnero, A. M., Mayta-Tristan, P., Konda, K. A., Mezones-Holguin, E., Bernabe-
 Ortiz, A., Alvarado, G. F., ... Lescano, A. G. (2017). Plagiarism, Cheating
 and Research Integrity: Case Studies from a Masters Program in Peru.
Science and Engineering Ethics, 23(4), 1183–1197.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-016-9820-z>

- Chambers, E., & Gregory, M. (2006). *Teaching & Learning English Literature*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Chang, C. W., Lee, J. H., Wang, C. Y., & Chen, G. D. (2010). Improving the authentic learning experience by integrating robots into the mixed-reality environment. *Computers and Education*, 55(4), 1572–1578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.06.023>
- Cheng, L., Rogers, W. T., & Wang, X. (2008). Assessment purposes and procedures in ESL/EFL classrooms. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(1), 9–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930601122555>
- Chou, S.-W., & Liu, C.-H. (2005). Learning effectiveness in a Web-based virtual learning environment: a learner control perspective. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(1), 65–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2005.00114.x>
- Clayton, J. (2007). The validation of the online learning environment survey. In *Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007: Full paper: Clayton* (pp. 159–167).
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. Education (6th ed.). London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Coughlin, P. E. (2015). Plagiarism in five universities in Mozambique: Magnitude, detection techniques, and control measures. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 11(1), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-015-0003-5>
- Creme, P., & Lea, M. R. (2008). *Writing at University: A guide for students* (Third Edit). Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education Open University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Educational Research. Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2010). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative*,

Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.my/books?id=J4w5DwAAQBAJ>

- Cumming, a. (2001). ESL/EFL instructors' practices for writing assessment: specific purposes or general purposes? *Language Testing*, 18(2), 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220101800206>
- Dabbagh, N. (2003). Scaffolding: An important teacher competency in online learning. *TechTrends*, 47(2), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02763424>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(3), 291–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399>
- Davison, C., & Cummins, J. (2007). Assessment and Evaluation in ELT: Shifting Paradigms and Practices. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *The Good Research Guide: For small-scale social research projects*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education Open University Press.
- DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40(4), 314–321. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x>
- DIKTI. (2012). Publikasi Karya Ilmiah. Jakarta. Retrieved from <http://www.kopertis12.or.id/2012/02/01/surat-dirjen-dikti-no-152et2012-tentang-wajib-publikasi-ilmiah-bagi-s1s2s3.html>
- Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Tinggi. (2014). Pangkalan Data Perguruan Tinggi. Retrieved from <http://forlap.dikti.go.id/perguruantinggi>
- Do Ba, K., Do Ba, K., Lam, Q. D., Le, D. T. B. A., Nguyen, P. L., Nguyen, P. Q., & Pham, Q. L. (2017). Student plagiarism in higher education in Vietnam: an empirical study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(5), 934–946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1263829>

- Donahue, P. L. (2001). *The nation's report card fourth-grade reading 2000*. DIANE Publishing.
- Dunn, S. V., & Hansford, B. (1997). Undergraduate nursing students' perceptions of their clinical learning environment. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(6), 1299–1306. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.19970251299.x>
- Ebel, R. L., & Frisbie, D. A. (1991). *Essentials of Educational Measurement*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Eriksson, L., & McGee, T. R. (2015). Academic dishonesty amongst Australian criminal justice and policing university students: individual and contextual factors. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 11(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-015-0005-3>
- Fisher, W. P. (2007). Rating scale instrument quality criteria. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 21(1), 1095.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356600>
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education. Qualitative Research*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Giannoni, D. L., & Tesone, D. V. (2003). What academic administrators should know to attract senior level faculty members to online learning environments. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 6(1), 16.
- Glasgow, N. A. (1996). *Doing Science: Innovative Curriculum for the Life Sciences*. ERIC.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (2007). *Looking in Classrooms*. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Looking_in_Classrooms.html?id=aC5YnwEACAAJ&pgis=1
- Green, S. P. (2002). Plagiarism, Norms, and the Limits of Theft Law: Some Observations on the Use of Criminal Sanctions in Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 54(1).

<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.315562>

Greenwald, E. A., Persky, H. R., Campbell, J. R., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP 1998 Writing Report Card for the Nation and the States*. ERIC.

Gregg, L. W., & Steinberg, E. R. (2016). *Cognitive processes in writing*. Routledge.

Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2011). *Applied thematic analysis*. Sage.

Guest, R., Rohde, N., Selvanathan, S., & Soesmanto, T. (2018). Student satisfaction and online teaching. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 2938, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1433815>

Halgamuge, M. N. (2017). The use and analysis of anti-plagiarism software: Turnitin tool for formative assessment and feedback. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 25(6), 895–909. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.21842>

Hanna, K. J. (2009). *Student perceptions of teacher comments: Relationships between specific aspects of teacher comments and writing apprehension*. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. The University of North Dakota, United States -- North Dakota.

Haug, A. (2018). Acquiring materials knowledge in design education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, (February). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10798-018-9445-4>

Hawley, C. S. (1984). The Thieves of Academe : System Plagiarism in the University. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 32(1), 35–39. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27565598>

Henderson, M., Selwyn, N., & Aston, R. (2017). What works and why? Student perceptions of “useful” digital technology in university teaching and learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(8), 1567–1579. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1007946>

Henderson, R. H., & Sundaresan, T. (1982). Cluster sampling to assess immunization coverage: a review of experience with a simplified sampling

- method. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 60(2), 253–260.
- Hertzog, M. A. (2008). Considerations in determining sample size for pilot studies. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 31(2), 180–191.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20247>
- Hill, C., & Parry, K. (1994). *From testing to assessment: English as an international language*. Longman.
- Hinostroza, J. E. (2018). *ICT-Supported Innovations in Small Countries and Developing Regions*. (I. A. Lubin, Ed.). Cham: Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67657-9>
- Hinton, P. R., McMurray, I., & Brownlow, C. (2014). *SPSS explained*. Routledge.
- Horvath, B. K. (1984). The components of written response: A practical synthesis of current views. *Rhetoric Review*, 2(2), 136–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/07350198409359067>
- Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2015). Chinese University Students' Perceptions of Plagiarism. *Ethics & Behavior*, 25(3), 233–255.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2014.923313>
- Huot, B. (1996). Toward a New Theory of Writing Assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(4), 549–566.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/358601>
- Hyland, K. (1999). Academic Attribution: Citation and the Construction of Disciplinary Knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(3), 341–367.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.3.341>
- Jackson, P. A. (2006). Plagiarism Instruction Online: Assessing Undergraduate Students' Ability to Avoid Plagiarism. *College Research Libraries*, 67(5), 418–428.
- Johanson, G. a., & Brooks, G. P. (2009). Initial Scale Development: Sample Size for Pilot Studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 70(3), 394–400.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164409355692>

- Jones, K. O., & Moore, T. A. (2010). Turnitin is not the primary weapon in the campaign against plagiarism. In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Computer Systems and Technologies and Workshop for PhD Students in Computing on International Conference on Computer Systems and Technologies - CompSysTech '10* (p. 425). New York, New York, USA: ACM Press. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1839379.1839454>
- Jordan, R. R. (2003). *Academic writing course : study skills in English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Kaufer, D. S., & Geisler, C. (1989). Novelty in Academic Writing. *Written Communication*, 6(3), 286–311.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088389006003003>
- Kaufman, J. C., Baer, Jo., & Gentile, C. A. (2004). Differences in Gender and Ethnicity as Measured by Ratings of Three Writing Tasks. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 38(1), 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2162-6057.2004.tb01231.x>
- Kember, D., Ho, a., & Hong, C. (2008). The importance of establishing relevance in motivating student learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 9, 249–263. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787408095849>
- Kementerian Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia. (2010). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia tentang Pencegahan dan Penanggulangan Plagiat di Perguruan Tinggi.
- Kent, D. (2002). *Sharpening your writing skills. A Workshop for Business and Technical Writers*. Duncan Kent & Associates Ltd.
- Kissner, E. (2006). *Summarizing, paraphrasing, and retelling: Skills for better reading, writing, and test taking*. Heinemann Educational Books.
- Krashen, S. D. (1999). Seeking a Role for Grammar: A Review of Some Recent Studies. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32(2), 245–254.
- Krejcie, R. V, & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research

Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>

Kutieleh, S., & Adiningrum, T. S. (2011). How different are we? Understanding and managing plagiarism between East and West. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 5(2), A88–A98.

Lam, R. (2013). Two portfolio systems: EFL students' perceptions of writing ability, text improvement, and feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 18(2), 132–153.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2012.10.003>

Lee, G., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Constructing Trust Between Teacher and Students Through Feedback and Revision Cycles in an EFL Writing Classroom. *Written Communication*, 25(4), 506–537.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088308322301>

Lee, I. (2007). Assessment for Learning: Integrating Assessment, Teaching, and Learning in the ESL/EFL Writing Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 64(1), 199–213.
<https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.64.1.199>

Lenth, R. V. (2001). Some Practical Guidelines for Effective Sample Size Determination. *The American Statistician*, 55(3), 187–193.
<https://doi.org/10.1198/000313001317098149>

Lin, C.-H. S., & Wen, L.-Y. M. (2006). Academic dishonesty in higher education—a nationwide study in Taiwan. *Higher Education*, 54(1), 85–97.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-006-9047-z>

Linacre, J. M. (1994). Sample size and item calibration stability. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 7(4), 328.

Linacre, J. M. (2002). What do infit and outfit, mean-square and standardized mean. *Rasch Measurement Transactions*, 16(2), 878.

Liu, G.-Z., Lu, H.-C., Lin, V., & Hsu, W.-C. (2018). Cultivating undergraduates' plagiarism avoidance knowledge and skills with an online tutorial system.

- Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, (January 2017), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12223>
- Ma, H. J., Wan, G., & Lu, E. Y. (2008). Digital Cheating and Plagiarism in Schools. *Theory Into Practice*, 47(3), 197–203.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802153809>
- Manalu, M. H. (2013). Students' Perception on Plagiarism. *Passage*, 1(2), 71–80.
 Retrieved from <http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/psg/article/view/539>
- Manchón, R. M. (2009). *Writing in Foreign Language Contexts*. (D. Singleton, Ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Manser, M. H. (2006). *The Facts on File Guide to Good Writing*. Facts On File.
- Maor, D. (2003). The Teacher's Role in Developing Interaction and Reflection in an Online Learning Community. *Educational Media International*, 40(1–2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0952398032000092170>
- Maurer, H. (2017). Problems and solutions for using computer (networks) for education. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 10(1), 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-08-2016-0002>
- Mavrinac, M., Brumini, G., Bilić-Zulle, L., & Petrovečki, M. (2010). Construction and Validation of Attitudes Toward Plagiarism Questionnaire. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 51(3), 195–201. <https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2010.51.195>
- McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1993). Academic Dishonesty: Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), 522. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2959991>
- McKimm, J., Jollie, C., & Cantillon, P. (2003). ABC of learning and teaching: Web based learning. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, 326(7394), 870–873.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30029.x>
- Mcnamara, T. (2003). Book review. *Language Testing*, 20(4), 466–473.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532203lt268xx>

- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (2014a). Novelty. Retrieved November 18, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/novelty>
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (2014b). Spelling. Retrieved October 13, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/spelling>
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2014). Plagiarism - Definition and More from the Free Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved October 18, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/plagiarism>
- Mishan, F. (2005). *Designing authenticity into language learning materials*. Intellect Books.
- Modell, H. I., & Michael, J. A. (1993). Promoting Active Learning in the Life Science Classroom: Defining the Issues. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 701(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1993.tb19770.x>
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002>
- Moos, R. H. (1980). Evaluating classroom learning environments. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 6(3), 239–252. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-491X\(80\)90027-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-491X(80)90027-9)
- Morse, J. M. (2000). Determining Sample Size. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10(1), 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973200129118183>
- Mowery, D. C., & Simcoe, T. (2002). Is the Internet a US invention? - An economic and technological history of computer networking. *Research Policy*, 31(8–9), 1369–1387. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333\(02\)00069-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(02)00069-0)
- Muncie, J. (2002). Finding a place for grammar in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 180–186.
- National Council of Teachers of English. (2013). Writing Assessment : A Position Statement Writing Assessment : A Position Statement. Retrieved from

<http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/writingassessment>

Naylor, P., & Cowie, H. (1999). The effectiveness of peer support systems in challenging school bullying: the perspectives and experiences of teachers and pupils. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(4), 467–479.

<https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1999.0241>

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Pearson Education, Limited. Retrieved from

https://books.google.com.my/books?id=_o0rnwEACAAJ

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559>

Niyogi, N. S. (1995). *Capturing the Power of Classroom Assessment*. Educational Testing Service. Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/capturing-the-power-of-classroom-assessment/oclc/33341400>

Nor, A. C. M., Zamalia, M., & Nor, A. M. G. (2011). Application of Rasch Measurement Model in Validation and Analysis of Measurement Instruments in Statistical Education Research.

Norgaard, R. (2004). Writing information literacy in the classroom: Pedagogical enactments and implications. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 43(3), 220–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20864203>

O’Grady, W. D., & Archibald, J. (2008). *Contemporary Linguistic Analysis: An Introduction*. Pearson Longman.

Octaberlina, L. R. (2009). Plagiarism In English Language Theses In Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 14(3).

Orsmond, P., Merry, S., & Reiling, K. (2004). Undergraduate project work: can directed tutor support enhance skills development? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(5), 625–642.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930410001689180>

- Oxford Dictionary. (2014). Spelling. Retrieved October 13, 2014, from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/spelling>
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1999). Grade level and gender differences in the writing self-beliefs of middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 24(4), 390–405. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1998.0995>
- Park, C. (2003). In Other (People's) Words: Plagiarism by university students-- literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 471–488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301677>
- Pearson, J., & Trinidad, S. (2005). OLES: an instrument for refining the design of e-learning environments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 21(6), 396–404. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2005.00146.x>
- Perry, B. (2010). Exploring academic misconduct: Some insights into student behaviour. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(2), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787410365657>
- Pickard, J. (2006). Staff and student attitudes to plagiarism at University College Northampton. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(2), 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262528>
- Pontis, S., Blandford, A., Greifeneder, E., Attalla, H., & Neal, D. (2017). Keeping up to date: An academic researcher's information journey. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 68(1), 22–35. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23623>
- Prince, M. (2004). Does Active Learning Work? A Review of the Research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93(3), 223–231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2004.tb00809.x>
- Pupovac, V., Bilic-zulle, L., Mavrinac, M., & Petroveck, M. (2010). Attitudes toward plagiarism among pharmacy and medical biochemistry students – cross-sectional survey study. *Biochemia Medica*, 20(3), 307–313.
- Reeve, J., & Jang, H. (2006). What teachers say and do to support students'

autonomy during a learning activity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 209.

- Rennie, S. C., & Crosby, J. R. (2001). Are “tomorrow’s doctors” honest? Questionnaire study exploring medical students’ attitudes and reported behaviour on academic misconduct. *BMJ*, 322(7281), 274–275.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.322.7281.274>
- Risquez, A., O’Dwyer, M., & Ledwith, A. (2011). Technology enhanced learning and plagiarism in entrepreneurship education. *Education + Training*, 53(8/9), 750–761. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911111185062>
- Roberts, T. S. (2008). *Student plagiarism in an online world: problems and solutions*. (K. Klinger, K. M. Roth, J. Thompson, R. Miller, J. Neidig, S. Reed, & J. Young, Eds.). Hershey and New York: Information Science Reference.
- Rogers, W. T. (1991). Educational Assessment in Canada : Evolution or Extinction? *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 37(2), 179–192.
- Rossen, S., & Ko, S. (2010). *Teaching Online: A Practical Guide, Third Edition*. Retrieved from
<http://book4you.org/s/?q=teaching+online&t=0%5Cnpapers3://publication/uuid/30929013-3023-4BB3-93D8-CE27C3C2AC05>
- Rovai, A. P. (2000). Online and traditional assessments: what is the difference? *The Internet and Higher Education*, 3(3), 141–151.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516\(01\)00028-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(01)00028-8)
- Rubin, R. E. (2017). *Foundations of library and information science*. American Library Association.
- Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 259–291.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, 3, 3–36.

- Slepkov, H. (2008). Teacher professional growth in an authentic learning environment. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 41(1), 85–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2008.10782524>
- Smith, M., Ghazali, N., & Minhad, S. F. N. (2007). Attitudes towards plagiarism among undergraduate accounting students: Malaysian evidence. *Asian Review of Accounting*, 15(2), 122–146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13217340710823350>
- Sommers, N. (2006). Across the Drafts. *College Composition and Communication*, 58(2), 248–257. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20456939>
- Song, L., Singleton, E. S., Hill, J. R., & Koh, M. H. (2004). Improving online learning: Student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(1), 59–70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.003>
- Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 226–233. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci042>
- Sparks-Langer, G. M., Simmons, J. M., Pasch, M., Colton, A., & Starko, A. (1990). Reflective Pedagogical Thinking: How Can We Promote It and Measure It? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(5), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248719004100504>
- Stueart, R. D., & Moran, B. B. (2007). *Library and information center management*.
- Sullivan, P. (2001). Gender differences and the online classroom: Male and female college students evaluate their experiences. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 25(10), 805–818. <https://doi.org/10.1080/106689201753235930>
- Sutherland-smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the Internet and Student Learning: Improving Academy Integrity*. New York and London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2003). The right to own: internationalization of perspectives of plagiarism and the internet. In *Refereed Conference Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Language Education and Diversity* (pp. 1–10). Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the Internet, and Student Learning: Improving Academic Integrity*. Taylor & Francis.
- Svobodova, Z., Katzorke, H., Jaekel, U., Dugovicova, S., Scoggin, M., & Treacher, P. (2000). *Writing in English: A Practical Handbook for Scientific and Technical Writers*. Writing in English Project Group.
- Swann, J., & Ecclestone, K. (1999). Improving lecturers' assessment practice in higher education: a problem-based approach. *Educational Action Research*, 7(1), 63–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650799900200082>
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.my/books?id=F8BFOM8DCKoC>
- Taylor, P. C., & Maor, D. (2000a). The Constructivist On-Line Learning Environment Survey (COLLES). Perth: Curtin University of Technology.
- Taylor, P. C., & Maor, D. (2000b). The Constructivist On-Line Learning Environment Survey (COLLES) Example: Actual. Curtin University of Technology.
- Taylor, P., & Maor, D. (2000). Assessing the efficacy of online teaching with the Constructivist Online Learning Environment Survey. In *9th Annual Teaching Learning Forum*. Perth, W.A.
- the late Henry A. Murray. (2007). *Explorations in Personality*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.my/books?id=0zdBlMoUZ9gC>
- Townley, C., & Parsell, M. (2005). Technology and Academic Virtue: Student Plagiarism Through the Looking Glass. *Ethics and Information Technology*,

6(4), 271–277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-005-5606-8>

Trauth, L. (2007). Grading Rubrics (Ids , exam essays , and papers). Retrieved from http://student.ccbcmd.edu/~ltrauth/history/american/american_rubrics.pdf

Trinity Inclusive Curriculum. (2012). Written Work: What you are assessing?

Tsui, A. S., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1989). BEYOND SIMPLE DEMOGRAPHIC EFFECTS: THE IMPORTANCE OF RELATIONAL DEMOGRAPHY IN SUPERIOR-SUBORDINATE DYADS. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(2), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256368>

Tuckett, A. G. (2005). Applying thematic analysis theory to practice: a researcher's experience. *Contemporary Nurse : A Journal for the Australian Nursing Profession*. <https://doi.org/10.5172/conu.19.1-2.75>

Tullos, D. C. (2014). Research Paper Grading Rubric. Harding University. Retrieved from http://www.harding.edu/tullos/Paper_Grades.pdf

van Teijlingen, E., & Hundley, V. (2002). The importance of pilot studies. *Nursing Standard*, 16(40), 33–36. <https://doi.org/10.7748/ns2002.06.16.40.33.c3214>

Wagner, R. F. (1993). Medical student academic misconduct: implications of recent case law and possible institutional responses. *Academic Medicine : Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 68(12), 887–889. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8259957>

Walker, S. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2005). Development and Validation of an Instrument for Assessing Distance Education Learning Environments in Higher Education: The Distance Education Learning Environments Survey (DELES). *Learning Environments Research*, 8(3), 289–308. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-005-1568-3>

Welkowitz, J., Cohen, B. H., & Ewen, R. B. (2006). *Introductory statistics for the behavioral sciences*. John Wiley & Sons.

Wilson, R. J. (1999). Aspects of validity in large-scale programs of student assessment. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 45(4).

- Xu, Y. (2009). Teacher Assessment Knowledge and Practice : A Narrative Inquiry of a Chinese College EFL Teacher's Experience. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43(3).
- Yugianingrum. (2008). Citations and Citing Behaviors in EFL Undergraduate Theses. *Educationist*, II(2), 74–85.
- Zainal, A. (2012). Validation of an ESL writing test in a Malaysian secondary school context. *Assessing Writing*, 17(1), 1–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.08.002>